

extreme problem to the systematists actually working on each group, but it will drastically affect non-taxonomically oriented biologists. I thus anticipate that such rules are likely to be honoured more in the breach than the observance, as is already the tendency at the family group level. ('It involves too much time and effort to track down which author first used a name based on a generic name within the family group—systematists have more important things to do!' is a common argument). If rules are to be proposed then they must be such that most biologists will honour them. I suspect that any rules governing higher taxa, especially ones requiring extensive name changes, will not be so honoured, and it is for that reason that my proposals referred to above were put forward as principles and not as rules.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF
GALEOPSOMYIA GIRAULT, 1916. Z.N.(S.)2402
(see vol. 39, pp. 297–301)

(1) By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA, Leiden, Netherlands*)

(1) In their paragraph 3 the applicants state that Nowicki, 1929, designated *Trichaporus aleyrodus* Mercet, 1930, as the type species of *Trichaporus* Foerster, and *Trichaporus melleus* Ashmead, 1904, as type species of *Trichaporus* Ashmead, 1900. Furthermore, they state that this practice was generally accepted by workers since 1929. In their paragraph 5, however, they state *Trichaporus* Foerster sensu Nowicki is a senior synonym of a generally accepted name, *Encarsia* Foerster; and that *Trichaporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki is a senior synonym of the widely used name *Galeopsomyia* Girault. The wide use of *Encarsia* and *Galeopsomyia* seems to be in contradiction to the general acceptance (after 1929) of their respective senior synonyms *Trichaporus* and *Trichaporus* sensu Nowicki. Can they explain this?

(2) If Ashmead, 1900, when using the spelling *Trichaporus* for the generic name *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856, did not indicate expressly that he intentionally changed Foerster's spelling, *Trichaporus* is not an emendation but an erroneous subsequent spelling and consequently has no status. Therefore there is no reason to suppress it. The fact that he used *Trichaporus* several times in his paper does not show at all that it is intended as an emendation. He may have misread the word.

In 1949 Miss Buitendijk and I published a paper on a crab the name of which we cited as *Rhitropanopeus* Rathbun, 1898. We used that spelling consistently and frequently in the paper. Later it was pointed out to us that the correct spelling is *Rhithropanopeus*. I can emphatically state that our spelling was not an emendation but simply an error.

I believe that we should define 'emendation' very strictly. Either the author definitely states that he emends an older name, or he uses both spellings and makes it clear that he employs the new spelling to replace the old.

(2) Reply by J. LaSalle and P. DeBach

Dr Holthuis is right in assuming that workers have in general accepted the (incorrect and invalid) designations by Nowicki of *Trichoporus aleyrodis* Mercet, 1930 as type species of *Trichoporus* Foerster, 1856 and of *Trichoporus melleus* Ashmead, 1904 as type species of *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900. However, wide usage of the names *Encarsia* and *Galeopsomyia* is not inconsistent with those facts.

Since 1929 *Trichoporus* Foerster has been considered by some authors to be a valid generic name and by others to be a synonym of *Encarsia*. Those who have recognised it as a synonym of *Encarsia* (this synonymy is now generally accepted) have avoided the priority issue by placing *Trichoporus* as a junior synonym of *Encarsia* by citing the authorship as '(Foerster) Nowicki, 1929'. The fact that authors have resorted to this obviously illegitimate postdating of the authorship shows how important workers have felt the name *Encarsia* to be. The fact is that *Trichoporus* Foerster sensu Nowicki, while sometimes considered a synonym of *Encarsia*, has never been used as a senior synonym of *Encarsia*, even though that is what it clearly must be if *T. aleyrodis* were the correct type species.

Dr Holthuis's confusion regarding *Trichoporus* arises from the fact that *Trichoporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki is not a synonym of *Galeopsomyia* as stated in his question. Nowicki designated *T. melleus* as type species of *Trichoporus*, and that has since been considered to make the name a junior synonym of *Exurus* Philippi, 1873 (a eulophid). It was not until many years after Nowicki that it was realised that these genera have anything to do with *Galeopsomyia*. We pointed out in 1981 that the correct type species for *Trichoporus* Foerster is *Euderus columbianus* Ashmead, 1888, and that this same species was chosen by Girault, 1916, as the type species of *Galeopsomyia* as well. If *Trichoporus* is treated as an emendation of *Trichoporus* (as in our application), it is a junior objective synonym of the latter and takes the same type species, and then it becomes an objective synonym of *Galeopsomyia*. If it is an erroneous subsequent spelling (as Dr Holthuis claims), it has no existence in nomenclature.

The contradiction mentioned by Dr Holthuis therefore does not exist, because even though Nowicki's invalidly designated type species were generally accepted, *Trichoporus* (in anybody's sense of the name) was never used as a senior synonym of *Encarsia* and *Trichoporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki was never used as a synonym of *Galeopsomyia*. In fact neither of these names (sensu Nowicki) was ever used as a senior synonym of any other name.

On Dr Holthuis's second point, since our purpose is to get rid of *Trichoporus*, we are happy to accept his view that the name is an erroneous subsequent spelling without status in nomenclature. Points (1) and (4) of our detailed proposals should be modified accordingly. Mention of *Trichoporus* should be deleted in (1) and (4) should read: 'place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: (a) *Trichoporus* Foerster, 1856, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above; (b) *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900, an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Trichoporus*.'